In the Specification:

Please amend the paragraph beginning at page 2, line 31 extending to page 3, line 9 as follows:

However, as the thirst for seamless end user connectivity grows, so does the diversity of customers desirous of reaping the benefits of a high-capacity OTN. Thus, a new generation of customer has appeared alongside the more traditional large and medium-sized legacy customer. Many of these newer customers utilize equipment which produces client signals in a format which is not easily encapsulated by the transport signal formats currently used in most existing OTNs. As a result of the incompatibility existing between today's OTNs and many of the "nontraditional" client signal formats employed by an emerging customer base, end-to-end connectivity and its myriad potential benefits are seldom realized.

Please amend the paragraph beginning on page 15, line 19 and ending on line 26 as follows:

Next, Fig. 4C illustrates the situation where the number of client bytes received at the ingress interface during μ microseconds is not [[be]] a whole number. Specifically, client byte "K" has not been received in its entirety after the expiry of μ microseconds. In such cases, the received number of client bytes will fall between two adjacent integers (denoted "F_L" and "F_H"), the lesser of which is F_L and is computed as:

Please amend the paragraph beginning on page 23, line 4 and ending on line 12 as follows:

It should also be noted that the parameters M and N associated with the client signal rate must be signaled to the egress interface at the other end of the OTN ~~in order~~ for proper re-construction of the client signal to take place. To this end, the values of M and N could appear somewhere in the header or trailer information associated with the first transport frame. Alternatively, the values of M and N could be fed to the egress interface along a separate control channel.